

## **REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed September 15, 2009. Claims 1, 15, 16, 17, and 30 have been amended, and claims 1-2 and 4-42 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

1. Telephone Interview

The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, after reviewing the present response, to resolve or discuss any questions or outstanding issues in an effort to expedite examination of the present application.

2. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2 and 4-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Flam* (U.S. Patent No. 7,266,764) in view of *Lofton* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0154116 A1).

a. Non-analogous Art

*Flam* discloses a process control system that automatically monitors processes and performs activities based on conditions detected during monitoring. See abstract. "[A]lso disclosed is a graphical user interface for defining administrative queries, administrative activities, and administrative actions." See abstract. "Using the graphical user interface, the user of the system can define PR records as required for the occurrences that are important to his or her processes, can define his or her own PR activities in PR activity tables 835, can define his or her own queries in administrative query tables 845, including the activities to be performed in response to the queries, and can define an activity's actions in detail in action tables 857." Column 6, lines 26-33.

Accordingly, *Flam* describes setting up an administrative query to analyze process records (PR) for occurrences and to perform defined activities in response to a detected occurrence. It is noted that the graphical user interface described in *Flam* is used to define the administrative query which mines process records for a designated occurrence. The disclosed graphical user interface is not used by a group or project

team to chronicle issues involving a group project. In contrast, in exemplary claim 1, a group project is being undertaken by a group or project team, where the claimed graphical user interface chronicles issues being undertaken within the group project including their statuses and individual responsibilities and the steps being undertaken to complete the group project. Therefore, *Flam* is from a different field of endeavor and is not reasonably pertinent to solving the problem being addressed by exemplary claim 1.

Further, *Lofton* discloses a “system and method for scheduling providing an Internet-based calendar for use by a number of people, where each user has a personal calendar which is associated with the user through user identification data to permit users to automatically receive updates of events which have been posted by one or more other users to appear on the receiving user's calendar, with each user being able to post events on the user's own calendar and delete events on the user's own calendar whether or not the event to be deleted has been posted by another user or the deleting user.” See abstract. Accordingly, *Lofton* is not in the same field of endeavor as *Flam*. Moreover, *Lofton* is not reasonably pertinent to solving the problem being addressed by exemplary claim 1, such as chronicling issues being undertaken within a group project including their statuses and individual responsibilities and the steps being undertaken to complete the group project.

Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the solution of *Flam* or *Lofton* to address the subject matter of the pending claims. For at least these reasons, the rejection of the pending claims is improper. Further, for at least these reasons, the statement on page 11 of the Office Action that “one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Lofton does not teach away from or contradict Flam, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed” is incorrect and not supported by the teachings of the individual references. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

b. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

An issue tracking system, comprising:

***a centralized server that transmits a graphical user interface which tracks project issues of a group project over a network to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device and enabling a project member to chronicle issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities, wherein the statuses comprises indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific issue according to group management or administrator;***

***a database coupled to the centralized server that provides the graphical user interface to the centralized server, the database assisting in tracking at least one project issue related to the group project, to provide access through the centralized server to a plurality of users responsible for resolving said at least one project issue, and to provide a storage option for a user to upload data formats, the topic being a subject, available for selection by a user using the graphical user interface, under which the at least one project issue is related, the project issue being tracked using the issue tracking system, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface and the graphical user interface allows for deletion of a project step by the one or more users,***

wherein the centralized server transmits a notification to a responsible user for each occurrence of the following: a new project issue has been created, a step toward resolution has been entered for said at least one project issue, or said at least one project issue has been closed.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Flam* in view of *Lofton* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “a centralized server that transmits a graphical user interface which tracks project issues of a group project over a network to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device and enabling a project member to chronicle issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities, wherein the statuses comprises indications of a next step that

needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific issue according to group management or administrator; [and] a database coupled to the centralized server that provides the graphical user interface to the centralized server, the database assisting in tracking at least one project issue related to the group project, to provide access through the centralized server to a plurality of users responsible for resolving said at least one project issue, and to provide a storage option for a user to upload data formats, the topic being a subject, available for selection by a user using the graphical user interface, under which the at least one project issue is related, the project issue being tracked using the issue tracking system, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface,” as emphasized above.

For example, *Flam* describes a process control system that automatically performs activities based on conditions detected during monitoring. As shown in FIG. 9, a client application of the process control system is installed locally on a computer and is not transmitted from a centralized server. Furthermore, *Flam* describes a system for scheduling administrative queries of a process, such as a service or complaint process for servicing and escalating problems, and does not disclose a system that tracks group project issues in the manner claimed.

To illustrate, in a general service desk or complaint system, a problem is defined and the system helps coordinate the work of different people who work on the problem at different times, where the system may assign or escalate the problem to be handled to different persons at different times. In contrast, in claim 1, a group project is being undertaken by a group or project team, where the claimed graphical user interface chronicles issues being undertaken within the group project including their statuses and individual responsibilities and the steps being undertaken to complete the group project.

Further in the system for automatically monitoring processes disclosed in the reference, *Flam* discloses that a customer complaint process may be repeatedly queried by the automated system to determine if an assigned customer specialist has not replied to the customer in a preferred period of time and then make notification of this fact to his or her supervisor. Then, *Flam* discloses that the times in which the query

is run are recorded. See col. 5, lines 35-61. *Flam* additionally discloses that an operator can configure how an administrative query is to run. Accordingly, *Flam* is deficient in disclosing a project issue being tracked using an issue tracking system, wherein one or more users familiar with the project update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface, as described in claim 1.

Further, *Lofton* describes an Internet-based calendar and does not remedy the deficiencies of *Flam*. In particular, *Lofton* individually or in combination with *Flam* fails to teach or suggest at least “a centralized server that transmits a graphical user interface which tracks project issues of a group project over a network to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device and enabling a project member to chronicle issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities, wherein the statuses comprises indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific issue according to group management or administrator; [and] a database coupled to the centralized server that provides the graphical user interface to the centralized server, the database assisting in tracking at least one project issue related to the group project, to provide access through the centralized server to a plurality of users responsible for resolving said at least one project issue, and to provide a storage option for a user to upload data formats, the topic being a subject, available for selection by a user using the graphical user interface, under which the at least one project issue is related, the project issue being tracked using the issue tracking system, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface,” as recited in claim 1.

On page 5, the Office Action states that *Flam* discloses a graphical user interface “enabling a project member to chronicle issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities (col. 9, PR table 833, each PR record, which corresponds to an issue, contains an indication of the originator of the record and who the record is assigned to), wherein the statuses comprises indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group

members or users on the group project (fig. 17, 1727 corresponds to the current step, and 1729 corresponds to the next step to be taken.” With regard to Fig. 17 which the Office Action contends discloses chronicling the status of an issue needed to be undertaken, Applicant submits that Fig. 17 depicts a graphical user interface for an administrative query which is distinct from a PR record. Further, the administrative query lists steps to be performed in the administrative query which does not correspond to steps needed to be undertaken by one or more group members as chronicled by the claimed graphical user interface. In particular, “[e]ach row 1723 in window 1721 specifies an entry in the program sequence for the selected administrative query; . . . field 1727 specifies the administrative activity to be performed; field 1729 specifies what to do after the administrative activity specified in the entry has been executed.” Col. 33, lines 20-30.

The actions of the administrative query are not disclosed to be steps needed to be performed by group members. In addition, the graphical interface disclosed in Fig. 17 does not allow for chronicling an issue that needs to be undertaken within a group project.

On page 5, the Office Action further states that *Flam* discloses “wherein one or more users familiar with the project issue update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface (col. 6, lines 9-49).” In response, Applicant submits that this portion of the *Flam* reference discloses the “use of tables in DB system 825 to determine the behavior of the process control system” and user interfaces for configuring entries in these tables. See col. 6, lines 9-16. As such, *Flam* in view of *Lofton* fails to disclose “wherein one or more users familiar with the project issue update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface,” as suggested in the Office Action.

Lastly, the graphical user interface disclosed in *Flam* defines an administrative query, where an administrative query is not disclosed to allow for deleting process steps from any of the process records. Accordingly, *Flam* in view of *Lofton* fails to teach or suggest at least “the graphical user interface allows for deletion of a project step by the one or more users,” as recited in claim 1.

As a result, claim 1 is patentable over *Flam* in view of *Lofton*, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

c. Claims 2-16

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 2 and 4-16 depend from and include the features of claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 2-16 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

d. Claim 17

As provided in independent claim 17, Applicant claims:

A method of tracking project issues, comprising:  
storing a group project in a standardized format on a centralized database;

***transmitting a graphical user interface which tracks project issues over a network to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device, the graphical user interface chronicling issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities, wherein the statuses comprise indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific issue according to group management or administrator;***

***adding an issue associated with the group project to the centralized database using the graphical user interface, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the issue using the graphical user interface;***

directing addition of at least one step taken to resolve the issue to the centralized database;

transmitting a notification to a responsible user associated with the project for each occurrence of the following: a new issue has been created for the group project, a step toward resolution has been entered for the issue, or the issue has been closed; and

providing an option to a user to upload a data file using the graphical user interface.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 17 is allowable for at least the reason that *Flam* in view of *Lofton* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “transmitting a graphical user interface which tracks project issues over a network to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device, the graphical user interface chronicling issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities, wherein the statuses comprise indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific issue according to group management or administrator; [and] adding an issue associated with the group project to the centralized database using the graphical user interface, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the issue using the graphical user interface,” as emphasized above.

To illustrate, *Flam* describes a process control system that automatically performs activities based on conditions detected during monitoring. As shown in FIG. 9, a client application of the process control system is installed locally on a computer and is not transmitted from a centralized server. Furthermore, *Flam* describes a system for scheduling administrative queries of a process, such as a service or complaint process for servicing and escalating problems, and does not disclose a system which tracks group project issues in the manner claimed.

For example, in a general service desk or complaint system, a problem is defined and the system helps coordinate the work of different people who work on the problem at different times, where the system may assign or escalate the problem to be handled to different persons at different times. In contrast, in claim 17, a group project is being undertaken by a group or project team, where the claimed graphical user interface is chronicling issues being undertaken within the group project including their statuses and individual responsibilities and the steps being undertaken to complete the group project.

Further in the system for automatically monitoring processes disclosed in the reference, *Flam* discloses that a customer complaint process may be repeatedly queried by the automated system to determine if an assigned customer specialist has



not replied to the customer in a preferred period of time and then make notification of this fact to his or her supervisor. Then, *Flam* discloses that the times in which the query is run are recorded. See col. 5, lines 35-61. *Flam* additionally discloses that an operator can configure how an administrative query is to run. Accordingly, *Flam* is deficient in disclosing a project issue being tracked using an issue tracking method, wherein one or more users familiar with the project update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface, as described in claim 17.

Further, *Lofton* describes an Internet-based calendar and does not remedy the deficiencies of *Flam*. In particular, *Lofton* individually or in combination with *Flam* fails to teach or suggest at least “transmitting a graphical user interface which tracks project issues over a network to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device, the graphical user interface chronicling issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities, wherein the statuses comprise indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific issue according to group management or administrator; [and] adding an issue associated with the group project to the centralized database using the graphical user interface, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the issue using the graphical user interface,” as recited in claim 17.

On page 10, the Office Action states that *Flam* discloses a graphical user interface “chronicling issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities (col. 9, PR table 833, each PR record, which corresponds to an issue, contains an indication of the originator of the record and who the record is assigned to), wherein the statuses comprise indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project (fig. 17, 1727 corresponds to the current step, and 1729 corresponds to the next step to be taken.” With regard to Fig. 17 which the Office Action contends discloses chronicling the status of an issue needed to be undertaken, Applicant submits that Fig. 17 depicts a graphical user interface for an

administrative query which is distinct from a PR record. Further, the administrative query lists steps to be performed in the administrative query which does not correspond to steps needed to be undertaken by one or more group members as chronicled by the claimed graphical user interface. In particular, “[e]ach row 1723 in window 1721 specifies an entry in the program sequence for the selected administrative query; . . . field 1727 specifies the administrative activity to be performed; field 1729 specifies what to do after the administrative activity specified in the entry has been executed.” Col. 33, lines 20-30.

The actions of the administrative query are not disclosed to be steps needed to be performed by group members. In addition, the graphical interface disclosed in Fig. 17 does not allow for chronicling an issue that needs to be undertaken within a group project.

On pages 10-11, the Office Action further states that *Flam* discloses “wherein one or more users familiar with the project issue update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface (col. 6, lines 9-49).” In response, Applicant submits that this portion of the *Flam* reference discloses the “use of tables in DB system 825 to determine the behavior of the process control system” and user interfaces for configuring entries in these tables. See col. 6, lines 9-16. As such, *Flam* fails to disclose at least “wherein one or more users familiar with the project issue update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface,” as suggested in the Office Action.

As a result, claim 17 is patentable over *Flam* in view of *Lofton*, and the rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn.

e. Claims 18-29

For at least the reasons given above, claim 17 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 18-29 depend from and include the features of claim 17 and recite additional features, claims 18-29 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

f. Claim 30

As provided in independent claim 30, Applicant claims:

A computer readable medium having a program for tracking project issues, the program operable to perform:

storing a group project on a centralized database;

***transmitting a graphical user interface which tracks project issues over a network to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device, the graphical user interface chronicling issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities, wherein the statuses comprise indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific issue according to group management or administrator;***

***adding an issue associated with the group project to the centralized database using the graphical user interface, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the issue using the graphical user interface;***

directing addition of at least one step taken to resolve the issue to the centralized database;

transmitting a notification to a responsible user associated with the group project for each occurrence of the following: a new issue has been created for the group project, a step toward resolution has been entered for the issue, or the issue has been closed; and

providing an option to a user to upload a data file.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 30 is allowable for at least the reason that *Flam* in view of *Lofton* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “transmitting a graphical user interface which tracks project issues over a network to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device, the graphical user interface chronicling issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities, wherein the statuses comprise indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific issue according to group management or administrator; [and]

adding an issue associated with the group project to the centralized database using the graphical user interface, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the issue using the graphical user interface,” as emphasized above.

For example, *Flam* describes a process control system that automatically performs activities based on conditions detected during monitoring. As shown in FIG. 9, a client application of the process control system is installed locally on a computer and is not transmitted from a centralized server. Furthermore, *Flam* describes a system for scheduling administrative queries of a process, such as a service or complaint process for servicing and escalating problems, and does not disclose a system which tracks group project issues in the manner claimed.

To illustrate, in a general service desk or complaint system, a problem is defined and the system helps coordinate the work of different people who work on the problem at different times, where the system may assign or escalate the problem to be handled to different persons at different times. In contrast, in claim 30, a group project is being undertaken by a group or project team, where the claimed graphical user interface chronicles issues being undertaken within the group project including their statuses and individual responsibilities and the steps being undertaken to complete the group project.

Further in the system for automatically monitoring processes disclosed in the reference, *Flam* discloses that a customer complaint process may be repeatedly queried by the automated system to determine if an assigned customer specialist has not replied to the customer in a preferred period of time and then make notification of this fact to his or her supervisor. Then, *Flam* discloses that the times in which the query is run are recorded. See col. 5, lines 35-61. *Flam* additionally discloses that an operator can configure how an administrative query is to run. Accordingly, *Flam* is deficient in disclosing a project issue being tracked using an issue tracking process, wherein one or more users familiar with the project update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface, as described in claim 30.

Further, *Lofton* describes an Internet-based calendar and does not remedy the deficiencies of *Flam*. In particular, *Lofton* individually or in combination with *Flam* fails to teach or suggest at least “transmitting a graphical user interface which tracks project

issues over a network to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device, the graphical user interface chronicling issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities, wherein the statuses comprise indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific issue according to group management or administrator; [and] adding an issue associated with the group project to the centralized database using the graphical user interface, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the issue using the graphical user interface,” as recited in claim 30.

As a result, claim 30 is patentable over *Flam* in view of *Lofton*, and the rejection of claim 30 should be withdrawn.

g. Claims 31-42

For at least the reasons given above, claim 30 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 31-42 depend from and include the features of claim 30 and recite additional features, claims 31-42 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

3. Traversal of Finding of Official Notice

In the previous responses, Applicant traversed a finding of Official Notice. In the outstanding final Office Action, it is alleged that Applicant’s traversal was not adequate and therefore, the officially noticed facts are deemed admitted prior art.

Applicant again traverses this finding. First, please note that since an RCE is being filed to enable a new search for prior art, there is no basis for maintaining the finding of admitted prior art, AND, more importantly, the only requirement of the rule to prevent an admission is that applicant provide "A" reason, not that it be necessarily adequate to convince the Examiner of Applicant’s position. Also, it is noted that multiple RCEs have been filed during prosecution of the present application.

Additionally, per MPEP 2144.03, “an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner’s action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art.” Accordingly, in an earlier response, Applicant made the following arguments which are presented again for your consideration.

The Office Action states that a server being operable to communicate using a hypertext markup language is old and well-known. However, claim 2 does not simply recite a server communicating using a hypertext markup language. Specifically, claim 2 depends from claim 1 which recites:

An issue tracking system, comprising:

a centralized server that transmits a graphical user interface which tracks project issues of a group project over a network to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device and enabling a project member to chronicle issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities, wherein the statuses comprises indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific issue according to group management or administrator;

a database coupled to the centralized server that provides the graphical user interface to the centralized server, the database assisting in tracking at least one project issue related to the group project, to provide access through the centralized server to a plurality of users responsible for resolving said at least one project issue, and to provide a storage option for a user to upload data formats, the topic being a subject, available for selection by a user using the graphical user interface, under which the at least one project issue is related, the project issue being tracked using the issue tracking system, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface,

wherein the centralized server transmits a notification to a responsible user for each occurrence of the following: a new project issue has been created, a step toward resolution has been entered for said at least one project issue, or said at least one project issue has been closed.

Therefore, a server of the type claimed in claim 2 should not be considered to be of common knowledge or well-known in the art. For example, the earlier traversal stated with regard to claim 2 that “specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific

reasoning in support of the conclusion of common knowledge are not provided in the Office Action.” See page 18 of Applicant’s Response filed May 7, 2008. Further, Applicant noted that an affidavit was not provided to support the alleged facts. See page 18 of Applicant’s Response filed May 7, 2008. In addition, Application pointed that “it has not been established that a centralized server operable to transmit a graphical user interface which tracks project issues over a network and operable to communicate using a hypertext markup language, as described in claim 2, is capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known.” See page 18 of Applicant’s Response filed May 7, 2008.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that its traversal of the finding of Official Notice is adequate and should not be construed as an admission that the officially noticed facts are admitted prior art. For at least these reasons, it is improper to find that Applicant has admitted the noticed facts.

Per MPEP 2144.03(A), “It would not be appropriate for the examiner to take official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where the facts asserted to be well known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known.” Also, per MPEP 2144.03(B), “If such notice is taken, the basis for such reasoning must be set forth explicitly. The Examiner must provide specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support his or her conclusion of common knowledge.”

As specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning in support of the conclusion of common knowledge are not provided in the Office Action, the Official Notice and the rejections based upon this finding should be withdrawn. Further, under 37 CFR § 1.104(d)(2), if the rejections are based on facts within the personal knowledge of the examiner, “the data should be stated as specifically as possible, and the facts must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by an affidavit from the examiner. Such an affidavit is subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons.”

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that its traversal of the finding of Official Notice is adequate and should not be construed as an admission that the officially noticed facts are admitted prior art. Further, if these rejection are maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that document(s) be provided as support under 37 CFR § 1.104(d)(2).



### **CONCLUSION**

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Applicant reserves the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Applicant. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles W. Griggers/  
**Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283**

**AT&T Legal Department – TKHR**  
Attn: Patent Docketing  
One AT&T Way  
Room 2A-207  
Bedminster, NJ 07921  
Customer No.: **38823**